



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

cu

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,691	03/14/2002	Paulina Glavich	0112300-994	5155
29159	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC				JONES, SCOTT E
P. O. BOX 1135				
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3713		

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/098,691	GLAVICH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott E. Jones	3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on October 20, 2004 in which applicant submits a request for continued examination, amends claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 17, 21, 55, and 59, and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-62 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 20, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 12, 14-15, 25-29, 40-44, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1).

Fasbender et al. discloses a gaming device and method having a base game and a plurality of bonus games, wherein the first bonus game is triggered by a predetermined symbol or symbol combination obtained in the base game and wherein additional bonus games are

triggered by a predetermined symbol or symbol combination obtained on another payline in the base game or by obtaining a predetermined symbol or symbol combination in the first bonus game. Fasbender et al. discloses :

Regarding Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 21, and 55:

- a display device (Figs. 2-11);
- a primary/base game displayed on the display device (¶ 17);
- a set of reels in the primary/base game having a plurality of symbols (¶'s 17-21 and 36);
- a plurality of primary/base game awards associated with the primary/base symbols (¶'s 18, 35, 42, 45, and 55);
- a first secondary/bonus game(20) displayed on the display device (Abstract, Fig. 1, ¶'s 2, 17-21, 36, and 58);
- a set of reels in the first secondary/bonus game having a plurality of symbols which include at least one different symbol than the primary/base symbols (¶ 37);
- a second secondary/bonus game displayed on the display device (Abstract, Fig. 1, ¶'s 2, 17-21, 36, and 58);
- a plurality of secondary/bonus awards associated with the secondary/bonus symbols in each of the secondary/bonus games, wherein the secondary/bonus awards are different than the primary/base awards (¶ 45); and
- a processor causes the display device to display the set of reels in the primary/base game which are randomly determined, provides any primary/base awards associated with the primary/base symbols indicated on the reels in the

primary/base game, causes the display device to remove/replace the set of reels in the primary/base game with the set of reels in the first secondary/bonus game when a first triggering event occurs in the primary/base game, randomly determines the secondary/bonus symbols indicated by the set of reels of the first secondary/bonus game, provides any secondary/bonus awards associated with the secondary/bonus symbols indicated on the reels in the first secondary/bonus game, and causes the display device to replace the set of reels in the first secondary/bonus game with the second secondary/bonus game when a second triggering event occurs in the first secondary/bonus game, wherein the primary/base game does not include a triggering event which causes the processor to cause the display device to display the second secondary/bonus game (Abstract, Fig. 1, ¶'s 2, 17-21, 36-37, and 57-58).

Regarding Claims 2 and 7:

- a plurality of the secondary/bonus symbols of the first secondary/bonus game are different than the primary/base symbols (¶ 37).

Regarding Claims 3, 8, 10, 14, 18, and 22:

- all of the secondary/bonus symbols of the first secondary/bonus game are different than the primary/base symbols (¶ 37).

Regarding Claim 5:

- the second secondary game includes second secondary symbols which are different than the secondary symbols of the first secondary game (¶ 37).

Regarding Claims 25 and 40:

- at least one of the secondary awards is larger than all of the primary awards (¶ 45).

Regarding Claims 26 and 41:

- the secondary awards in the secondary game are different than the secondary awards in the first secondary game (¶ 45).

Regarding Claims 27 and 42:

- at least one of the secondary awards in the second secondary game is greater than all of the secondary awards in the first secondary game (¶ 45).

Regarding Claims 28, 43, and 55:

- a probability of obtaining a winning combination of symbols associated with each winning combination of the primary symbols in the primary game and each winning combination of the secondary symbols in the first secondary game, wherein the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of secondary symbols are different than the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of primary symbols (¶ 45).

Regarding Claims 29, 44, and 56:

- at least one of the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of secondary symbols in the first secondary game is greater than all of the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of primary symbols in the primary game (¶ 45).

Regarding Claim 57:

- the probabilities associated with winning combinations of secondary symbols in the second secondary game are different than the probabilities associated with winning combinations of secondary symbols in the first secondary game (¶ 45).

Regarding Claim 58:

- at least one of the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of secondary symbols in the second secondary game is greater than all of the probabilities associated with the winning combinations of secondary symbols in the first secondary game (¶ 45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1).

Fasbender et al. discloses that as discussed above regarding Claims 1-3, 5, 12, 14-15, 25-29, 40-44, and 55-58. Fasbender et al. seems to lack explicitly disclosing that a gaming device is operated through the Internet. However, operating gaming machines over a data network such as the Internet was well known to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. One would be motivated to do so because this provides an efficient and cost effective way to collect personal data from a game player or to reconfigure a gaming machine thereby possibly reducing the number of employees required to run a casino.

7. Claims 4, 6-11, 13, 17-24, 30-39, 45-54, and 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1) in view of Watts et al. (U.S. 5,775,692).

Fasbender et al. discloses that as discussed above regarding Claims 1-3, 5, 12, 14-15, 25-29, 40-44, and 55-58. Fasbender et al. seems to lack explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, and 59:

- the gaming device includes less secondary/bonus symbols of the first secondary/bonus game than the primary/base symbols (Column 1, lines 59-67, Column 2, lines 35-39).

Regarding Claims 20 and 24:

- operating gaming machines over a data network such as the Internet.

Watts et al. teaches of a gaming machine having a base game and secondary game(s). A predetermined outcome in the primary game triggers a first secondary game. Additional stages in the secondary game(s) can be implemented that are not triggered by the predetermined outcome in the primary game. Watts et al. and Fasbender et al. are analogous art since both describe slot machines having base and bonus games. Furthermore, Watts et al. teaches:

Regarding Claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, and 21:

- the gaming device includes less secondary/bonus symbols of the first secondary/bonus game than the primary/base symbols (Column 1, lines 59-67, Column 2, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to incorporate fewer symbols in a bonus/secondary game as taught in

Watts et al. in Fasbender et al. One would be motivated to do so because having less symbols on a secondary/bonus reel improve the overall odds of a player receiving an award in the bonus/secondary round.

Regarding claims 20 and 24, operating gaming machines over a data network such as the Internet was well known to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. One would be motivated to do so because this provides an efficient and cost effective way to collect personal data from a game player or to reconfigure a gaming machine thereby possibly reducing the number of employees required to run a casino.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed October 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
9. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection to claims 1-3, 5, 12, 14-15, 25-29, 40-44, and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1).
10. Regarding claim 1, In Fasbender, Applicant alleges "if a bonus round is triggered [in the primary game], one or more of the symbols 36 from the selected payline 35 in the primary game that qualified the player for the bonus round may be randomly replaced with other symbols, either from the same set of symbols used in the primary game or alternatively, from a different set of symbols." In response, the examiner notes Fasbender actually states, "none, one or more of the symbols 36 from the selected payline 35 in the primary game that qualified the player for the bonus round may be randomly replaced with other symbols..." in [0037] as cited by Applicant. Nevertheless, the examiner contends if at least one symbol is replaced on the selected

Art Unit: 3713

payline(s) (which encompasses each reel), that would equate to “replacing” the set of reels, especially if those symbols are replaced with a different set of symbols as described in paragraph [0037].

11. Applicant alleges “Fasbender does not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a plurality of bonus games where any of the bonus games are initiated based on a triggering event occurring in the bonus game or any other game other than the primary game.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fasbender describes how “an additional [plurality] bonus event” may be provided based on obtaining a trigger symbol in the bonus game [0058].

Therefore, the examiner maintains Fasbender anticipates the claims.

12. Applicant alleges claims 2-5 which depend from claim 1 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No.’s 10-11 above.

13. Regarding claim 6, in addition to those items already discussed, Applicant alleges Fasbender does not disclose, teach, or suggest a processor that causes the display device to replace the set of reels in a first bonus game with a second bonus game when a second triggering event occurs in the first bonus game or any bonus game initiated based on a triggering event that does not occur in the primary game.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fasbender describes how additional bonus games are triggered and that the reels of a first bonus game are replaced with a second bonus game. [0058].

14. Applicant alleges claims 7-8 which depend from claim 6 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 6. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 13 above.

15. Regarding claim 9, Applicant alleges the claim is allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No's 10-11 above.

16. Applicant alleges claims 10-11 which depend from claim 9 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 9. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 15 above.

17. Regarding claim 12, Applicant alleges Fasbender does not disclose, teach, or suggest removing the primary reels on the display device and replacing the primary reels with secondary reels in a first secondary game upon a first triggering event in the primary game.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner contends if at least one symbol is replaced on the selected payline(s) (which encompass each reel), that would equate to “replacing” the set of reels, especially if those symbols are replaced with a different set of symbols as described in [0037]. The examiner asserts removing reels equates to replacing reels.

18. Applicant alleges claims 13-16 which depend from claim 12 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 12. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 17 above.

19. Regarding claim 17, Applicant alleges the claim is allowable for the same reasons provided for claims 1, 6, 9, and 12. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No's 10-11 above.

20. Applicant alleges claims 18-20 which depend from claim 17 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 17. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 19 above.

21. Regarding claim 21, Applicant alleges the claim is allowable for the same reasons provided for claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 17, and 21. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No' 10-11 above.

22. Applicant alleges claims 22-24 which depend from claim 21 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 21. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 21 above.

23. Regarding claim 55, Applicant alleges the claim is allowable for the same reasons provided for claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 17, and 21. Applicant alleges Fasbender does not disclose, teach, or suggest replacing and/or removing the set of reels from the primary game with a set of reels in a secondary game or removing and replacing a set of reels from a first secondary game based on a second triggering event occurring in the first secondary game." The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner contends if at least one symbol is replaced on the selected payline(s) (which encompass each reel), that would equate to "replacing" the set of reels, especially if those symbols are replaced with a different set of symbols as described in [0037]. The examiner asserts removing reels equates to replacing reels.

24. Applicant alleges claims 56-58 which depend from claim 55 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 55. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 23 above.

25. Regarding claim 59, Applicant alleges the claim is allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 55. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 23 above.

26. Applicant alleges claims 60-62 which depend from claim 59 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 59. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 25 above.

27. Applicant alleges claim 16 which depends from claim 12 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1) is allowable for the same reasons provided from claim 12. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 17 above.

28. Regarding the rejection to claims 4, 6-11, 13, 17-24, 30-39, 45-54, and 59-62 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasbender et al. (U.S. 2002/0086725 A1) in view of Watts et al. (U.S. 5,775,692), Applicant alleges the claims are allowable because Watts allegedly does not remedy the deficiencies of Fasbender. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No.'s 10-11 above.

29. Applicant alleges claim 4 which depends from claim 1 is allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 10-11 above.

30. Regarding claim 6, Applicant alleges Fasbender does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a processor causes a display device to replace a set of reels in a base game with a set of reels in a bonus game when a triggering event occurs in the base game.” Also, Applicant alleges “the combination does not disclose a processor that causes the display device to replace a set of reels in the first bonus game with a second bonus game when a second triggering event occurs in the first bonus game.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fasbender describes how additional

bonus games are triggered and that the reels of a first bonus game are replaced with a second bonus game. [0058].

31. Applicant alleges claims 7-8 which depend from claim 6 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 6. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 30 above.

32. Regarding claim 9, Applicant alleges the combination of Fasbender and Watts does not disclose teach, or suggest the elements as described above. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 30 above.

33. Applicant alleges claims 10-11 which depend from claim 9 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 9. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 32 above.

34. Applicant alleges claim 13 which depends from claim 12 is allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 12. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 17 above.

35. Regarding claim 17, Applicant alleges the combination of Fasbender and Watts does not disclose teach, or suggest the elements as described above. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 30 above.

36. Applicant alleges claims 18-20 which depend from claim 17 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 17. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 35 above.

37. Applicant alleges claim 21 is allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 17. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 35 above.

Art Unit: 3713

38. Applicant alleges claims 22-24 which depend from claim 21 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 21. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 37 above.

39. Applicant alleges claims 30-34 which depend from claim 6 and claims 35-39 which depend from claim 9 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claims 6 and 9, respectively. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 30 above.

40. Applicant alleges claims 45-49 which depend from claim 17 and claims 50-54 which depend from claim 21 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claims 17 and 21, respectively. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No's 35 and 37 above.

41. Regarding claim 59, Applicant alleges the combination of Fasbender and Watts does not disclose teach, or suggest the elements as described above. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 30 above.

42. Applicant alleges claims 60-62 which depend from claim 59 are allowable for the same reasons provided for claim 59. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons presented in Item No. 41 above.

For the reasons discussed hereinabove, the examiner maintains the rejections as stated in Office Action, Paper No. 07102004.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-4438. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott E. Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 3713

sej

